DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 214 CS 210 438

AUTHOR Ledingham, John A., Jr.
TITLE The Kindness of Strangers: Predictor Variables in a Public Information Campaign.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography; *Donors; *Fund Raising; Humanitarianism; Mass Media; *Philanthropic Foundations; Predictor Variables; *Private Financial Support; Public Opinion; *Public Relations; Public Service; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Charitable Contributions; *Public Information Campaigns; United Way

ABSTRACT

A study examined the predictive power of four groups of variables in a public information campaign conducted by a charitable organization to raise funds. The variables related to contributions generally fell within four categories: attitudes, knowledge, promotion (which included both mass media and interpersonal communication), and demographics. Researchers constructed a survey questionnaire to gather information regarding these variables, and 501 subjects were randomly selected from the area telephone directory (only individuals who said they worked more than 30 hours per week qualified). Results supported findings of prior research that contributors were older, more educated, and had higher incomes than non-contributors. Attitudes were also closely related to giving but knowledge was not clearly related. Results indicated that a combination of the statistically significant variables from each group was a stronger predictor than any of the groups by itself, suggesting that additional, as yet unidentified, variables also seemed to be at work in the contribution decision making process. (Tables of data and 28 references are included.) (AEW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED281214

THE KINDNESS OF STRANGERS: PREDICTOR VARIABLES IN A PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN

by

John A. Ledingham, Jr., Ph.D.
University of Evansville

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Ledingham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 210438

The author is indebted to the United Way and the Communication Committee of that organization for its help during the data collection portion of this study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A B S T R A C T

This study examines the comparative predictive power of four groups of variables in a public information campaign conducted by a charitable organization. The four are attitudinal variables, knowledge-related variables, promotional variables, and demographic variables. The results of the study indicate that a combination of the statistically-significant variables from each group are a stronger predictor than any of the groups by itself. The results reinforce the open systems theory as it relates to the practice of public relations, and also indicates that additional, as yet unidentified variables, also are at work in the decision-making process as it relates to public information campaigns.

Development is one of the seven major areas that comprise the profession of public relations, and in most instances, the word "development" means fund raising.[1] This is particularly true for charitable organizations, because they, like Blanche DuBois in Streetcar Named Desire, depend to a great degree on the kindness of strangers. Maintaining the flow of that sweet milk of kindness is, in large part, the responsibility of the organization's public relations component. In recent years, the process has become increasingly sophisticated. Proliferation of computer technology allows charitable organizations to compile and maintain volunteer and contributor lists and to manage and manipulate these lists at the touch of a computer key. Recent declines in governmental funding mean charitable agencies must replace that dwindling support with grass-roots dollars.[2] "Bottom-line evaluation" has arrived as a management edict for charitable organizations. Seat-of-the-pants decision making is rapidly being replaced by "communication by objective" and the planning paradigm of situational analysis, goal setting and strategy development, program implementation, and evaluation.[3] In that environment, the role of the public relations practitioner has changed from that of a communication facilitator to one of a problem-solving process facilitator; one who recognizes the importance of de-massifying the mass public to effectively and efficiently reach the significant publics whose support is essential.[4] That process is often accelerated by volunteers from the professional community who frequently bring new perspectives to charitable organizations.[5] While the publicist's goals may still be rooted in the seed-bed era of publicity, today's public relations professional brings a full complement of skills to bear on problems that require public relations solutions. Increasingly, those efforts involve research as an integral part of the public information campaign.[6]

Review of the Literature

The research literature of public information campaigns provides a starting place for those interested in the design and effects of public information communication, use of information by audience members, and the interaction of communicated messages, decision making and human behavior.

As a result of their inquiry into reasons some information campaigns fail, Hyman and Sheatsley decided that those campaigns lacked the ability to bring about substantial change. They concluded:

1. Interested people acquire more information;
2. People seek out facts which support their existing attitudes;
3. Different groups interpret the same information differently;
4. Psychological barriers create problems;
5. Information does not necessarily change attitudes, and
6. Campaigns cannot rely simply on increasing the flow of information to spread their information effectively.[7]

Bauer's research underscored Hyman and Sheatsley's limited effects perspective on public information campaigns. Moreover, the research indicated that views of the audience as a monolithic mass able to be manipulated by mass media are inconsistent with behavior in the field.[8] Mendelsohn also concluded that the effects of public information campaigns may be limited. Nonetheless, he suggested that campaigns could increase knowledge and understanding, paving the way for changes in attitude and behavior.[9] However, after analysis of the results of an Advertising Council's campaign against crime, O'Keefe concluded that the findings "go far in refuting many of the hypotheses and assumptions concerning campaign efficacy posed (by limited-effects theory) in earlier decades. And they tend to support . . . views of the media (as) having potential for more substantial persuasive effects."[10]

Public information campaigns and charitable giving have also been analyzed from a marketing perspective. In that view, public members are seen contributing

to a charitable organization because they expect to have services rendered in return. In this perspective, charitable services are seen not unlike a packaged product, with donors weighing the worth of the anticipated services in the same way a consumer considers the attributes of a product. "The donor offers money to the organization and the organization offers an understanding that the funds will be distributed to and used by the member organizations," according to this study. Moreover, peer pressure is seen as playing a role in the process: "Even though there is no apparent personal incentive for an individual to contribute . . . there is likely a group incentive to make such a contribution."[11]

Grunig and Ipes' study of a campaign against drunk driving highlights the finding that mass media alone are seldom sufficient to bring about a behavioral change. They note that: "communication campaigns can help to change a person's behavior if the person also receives interpersonal support from friends or from . . . groups." Grunig and Ipes contend that a public information campaign serves only to place a problem on an audience member's agenda. Changes in attitude and behavior are infrequent because "passive publics frequently perceive constraints that prevent them from acting on an issue, and (those) constraints must be removed before a communication campaign can do more than make members of a public recognize a problem." Grunig and Ipes also found, however, that "public information campaigns can get people to accept simple solutions when asked in a public opinion poll." They add that to be effective ". . . (campaigns) must be supplemented by . . . interpersonal support." "For a campaign to move people to develop organized cognition and perhaps to change their behavior, it must show people how they can remove constraints to their personally doing anything about the problem," they concluded.[12]

Grunig and Ipes' observations regarding the relative strength of mass media and interpersonal communication are underscored by Chaffee. In his contribution to Rice and Paisley's anthology on public communication campaigns, Chaffee contends that ". . . media and personal communication are not rivals or substitutes for one another, but instead offer parallel sources of information and opinion that one might consult on a given issue. They are also reciprocally stimulating . . . one direct effect of mass communication is to increase interpersonal communication -- and one major motivation for using mass media is to prepare for face-to-face discussion."[13] Dervin adds further emphasis to this view when she notes: "Campaign messages work best only when they are supportive of other activities such as interpersonal network strategies."[14] Dervin also stresses the need for a thorough understanding of audiences obtained through a variety of research strategies. She contends that knowledge of an audience, when properly combined with a relevant message, can produce substantial results.[15]

Other studies and reports provide additional background.[16] A report by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, for example, indicates that people aged 35 to 64 years are most likely to contribute to a charity. Moreover, those aged 50 to 64 years are the biggest contributors to charitable organizations. Several other demographic characteristics -- a college education, an income of $50,000 or more, marital status and a professional occupation -- are also related to greater giving. According to this report, the most effective fundraising technique is a personal visit. Moreover, 62% of those interviewed said it is better to help people in your own community than people elsewhere.[17] As the result of

a study based on a United Way campaign, four observations were offered. Two relate to knowledge, one concerns social pressure, and another concerns impersonal communication. The observations are:

1. "The overall ability to identify funded agencies was extremely small" (most individuals could name, on an average, only one of 34 funded agencies);

2. "Any in-depth knowledge of agency services or effectiveness is virtually nonexistent;"

3. "Social pressure affects not only whether a family contributes but also how much a family contributes to the United Way;" and,

4. "Impersonal forms of solicitation such as television commercials and newspaper advertising appear to have little effect on contributions. The more personal . . . employer and supervisor solicitations are very effective."[18]

Another study focusing on the United Way -- in this case an unpublished report on two focus groups conducted by the United Way -- found that:

1. Contributors have a better knowledge and understanding of United Way and how it operates;

2. Awareness of the organization comes through the following:

   a. The workplace
   b. From a personal tragedy
   c. From personal experience, such as volunteer work, and,
   d. From advertising

3. Contributors want to know where the money goes; and,

4. There are misconceptions of the UW's administrative costs.[19]

Charitable organizations, due to favorable broadcast regulations, often use public service announcements (PSAs) as part of their campaign. Those PSAs, presented through different media, elicit differing responses. According to research by O'Keefe, Mendelsohn and Liu, television PSAs receive the most attention, and women are more attentive to those televised PSAs than are men.[20] In an article concerning United Way efforts to increase contributions from smaller companies, it was found that:

1. Smaller companies are less likely to launch a United Way campaign;
2. Smaller companies have lower rates of participation;
3. Smaller companies have smaller contributions than larger companies; and,
4. The most effective approach (for small businesses) is for small-business owners to solicit other small-business owners.[21]

Two issues which have received considerable attention in the popular press and elsewhere concerning the United Way (UW) are pressure on employers to contribute and monopolization of the charity field. A report in the Wall Street Journal, for example, claims that 15% of all employees surveyed felt coerced into contributing to the UW.[22] Others have examined the issue of monopolization by the UW.[23]

The findings and conclusions found in the literature can be summarized as the following:

1. Campaigns cannot depend on mass communication alone to motivate individuals to contribute to a charity;
2. Campaigns must be supported by interpersonal communication;
3. People seek out facts in an apparent effort to support their attitudes and/or behavior;
4. Attitudes and predispositions appear related to giving;
5. Perceived constraints must be removed for individuals to do more than simply recognize a problem as the result of a public information campaign;

6. Group pressure appears related to contributing to a charitable organization;

7. Knowledge of an organization's practices is related to contributions to that organization;

8. Contributors are better informed about the UW and how it works.

9. Members of the public have little knowledge of which agencies are funded by the UW, in-depth knowledge of the UW is unusual, contribution frequency and amount is influenced by social pressure, and impersonal forms of communication have little effect on contributions as compared to employer and supervisor solicitations;

10. Awareness of the UW comes through the workplace, personal experience (as a volunteer or because of a personal tragedy), and from advertising;

11. Donors to a charitable organization expect to see services in return;

12. Individuals want to know precisely where donated money goes and how it is used;

13. Contributors are predisposed to support help for community residents rather than those living outside the community;

14. Smaller companies are less likely than larger ones to become involved in a UW campaign;

    a. Those small companies that are involved usually have smaller rates of participation;

    b. The average contribution of an employee from a smaller company is less than that from a larger company;

    c. Small-business owners are best approached by other small-business owners when cooperation is being sought.

15. There is considerable perception that employees are coerced into giving to the UW; and,

16. Demographic characteristics are related to frequency and amounts of contributions.

The Study

The characteristics reported as being related to contributions generally fall within four categories: attitudes, knowledge, promotion (which includes both mass media and interpersonal communication), and demographic characteristics.

The four categories formed the basis for an analysis of a community's attitudes toward the UW and charitable organizations in general; knowledge of the UW, (where UW funds come from, how the organization disburses those funds, where and to whom); promotional techniques (mass-mediated messages and work-place solicitation); and demographic characteristics (gender, age, income, education, and marital status.

It was hoped, on an applied level, that the results of the study could help in the manner envisioned by Hyman and Sheatsley:

> . . . surveys can inform the information director of the whole structure of attitudes on any public issue. They can tell him the major factors affecting public opinion on the issue, and the relative influence of these various factors in determining attitudes. They can tell to what extent information has reached the public and how far it has changed existing opinions. They can also tell what information is still needed and what aspects of it must be stressed in order to reach the unexposed or unsympathetic groups.[24]

Theoretical Perspective

Views of the communication process have undergone tremendous change since Hyman and Sheatsley published their analysis of public information campaigns in 1947. The limited effects perspective seen emerging in Hyman and Sheatsley's report has come full circle, with many communication scholars now positing a more powerful role for communication within a culturally comprehensive model. Bauer's view of the obstinate audience is now assumed, and a stream of research has developed in that area. Evidence continues to accumulate to support the view advanced by numerous scholars that mass communicated messages, by themselves, do not have the force of mass and interpersonal communication combined.[25]

Elementary models of the communication process have increasingly been expanded. System theory sees communication as one subsystem operating within an environment, or suprasystem. The communication process is seen operating within

this suprasystem and affected by interaction between systems, and by the effects of the interaction between other systems.[26] Dependency theory conceptualizes the same sort of structure but also sees communication effects dependent on the needs of the individual attending to communication sources.[27]

The perspective which provides the backdrop for this study views interpersonal, group, organizational and mass communication as partners in the communication process, sharing the stage with societal structures, psychological barriers and predispositions, and personal experience.

Based on this view, we would expect to see numerous factors exerting an influence on human behavior, including attitudes, knowledge, promotion and demographics, the four areas explored in this study.

Method

A survey questionnaire was constructed to gather information regarding attitudes, knowledge, promotion and demographics. One series of questions sought to identify attitudes toward charitable organizations in general, distribution of funds collected by charitable organizations, government aid, competition for the charitable contribution, payroll deduction, the UW's umbrella concept (one organization soliciting funds for many agencies), the UW's "fair share" concept, the role of the UW in the community, funding for controversial agencies, selection of recipient agencies by UW donors, the usefulness of charitable organizations today compared with the past, and perceived pressure to contribute to the UW.

Another series of questions was designed to identify respondents' knowledge of the criteria the UW uses to distribute funds, the likelihood that someone known to the respondent is a recipient of aid from a UW agency, how much administrative cost is incurred by the UW, and whether funds collected in a community remain in that community.

Other questions were inserted to measure exposure to UW's mass media promotional messages. Still others sought to identify respondents who attended a UW meeting at their place of employment, viewed a UW film at work, or had received a solicitation memorandum or letter regarding the UW.

Questions regarding demographic information were also included, along with questions regarding contributions in general and contributions to the UW specifically.

The area telephone directory served as the sample frame with numbers selected using the nth selection strategy. A two-page screening procedure helped ensure the sample was not one of convenience. Interviews were conducted only with individuals who said they were employed 30 or more hours a week. Interviewers also rotated a filter question based on age and gender.

Some 501 usable interviews were completed in this manner. The questionnaires were then edge-coded and input for computer analysis using the SPSS program.

Results

Frequencies were generated for the overall sample, and for four subgroups; all contributors, non-contributors, contributors to the UW, and contributors to other (non-UW) charitable organizations (See Table 1).

The overall sample is comprised almost equally of males (50.4%) and females (49.6%), and averages 38.5 years of age. Most (69.8%) are married, and most (90.2%) have at least a high school education. The median income is reported as between $20,000 and $30,000 a year. The largest percentage (48.8%) of the respondents are employed by organizations that have a workforce of more than 100 workers. The majority (79.6%) are not members of a labor union. Most (88.4%) said they contributed to a charity last year, and, of those, a majority (71.9%) said they contributed to the UW.

Table 1 provides a comparative profile of the respondents. The small number of non-givers (11.6%, or 58 cases) precluded chi square tests of statistical significance with regard to many of the variables. Nonetheless, the frequencies themselves are consistent and suggestive, particularly with regard to givers and non-givers.

Non-givers are younger and earn less. The non-giver is twice as likely (51.7% to 25.3%) to be 29 years of age or younger than the giver, and four times as likely (36.2% to 8.6%) to earn less than $10,000 a year. Non-givers are not as likely to be a college graduate (8.6% to 15.6%), and considerably less likely to be married (72.7% of givers are married; 47.4% of non-givers are married). One fifth of all givers (20.4%) are labor union members, while only one-tenth (10.3%) of non-givers are labor union members. Non-givers are also more likely to work for organizations with smaller workforces. Non-givers are somewhat less likely (71.5% to 88.1%) to agree that the UW makes the community better for all, and more likely (46.6% to 34.7%) to report that no one they know is likely to use any of the UW agencies. Non-givers also tend to be less certain (55.2% to 64.7%) that funds collected by the UW remain in the community where they were collected.

Moreover, non-givers, as might be expected, are less committed (56.9% to 79.9%) to the "fair share" concept, and considerably less convinced (34.5% to 54.0%) of the efficiency of payroll deduction. They are also more likely to agree (46.5% to 27.2%) that government should provide all services for those in need. Moreover, non-givers attach less importance (30.7% to 15.5%) to "health-related" services, and are somewhat more likely (67.2% to 53.2%) to see large companies as the UW's primary source of funds.

However, it is in the area of promotion that the most dramatic differences are revealed. Non-givers are somewhat likely (37.9% to 44.5%) to recall hearing information about the UW from radio, to recall seeing a UW newspaper advertisement

(36.2% to 44.2%), or to have viewed the UW's promotional film (13.8% to 18.7%). However, givers were twice as likely (40.4% to 20.7%) to have received a UW letter or memo at work, and more than twice as likely (40.2% to 17.2%) to have attended a UW group meeting at their place of employment. Indeed, crosstabulation of the "contributed" variable with all other variables produced only four instances of cell case distributions that were substantially different as well as statistically significant -- education, size of the place of employment, a UW group meeting at the worksite, and receipt of a UW solicitation letter or memo where they are employed.

Crosstabulating "contributed to UW" with all other variables produced more or less the same kind of results. Differences with regard to the UW group meeting were both substantial (48.7% to 17.2%) and statistically significant, as was the case with the UW solicitation memorandum (46.9% to 20.7%), and company size. Moreover, there is some difference with regard to viewing of the UW film (viewed by 13.8% of non-givers and 22.0% of givers). Age and gender were also related to contributing to the UW, with non-givers more than twice as likely to be 29 years of age or younger, and with non-givers more likely to be male (60.3% of non-givers are male, while 46.0% of UW givers are male).

As noted, the small number of non-donors precluded chi square tests of many of the variables. The problem was made more difficult by the fact that many of the independent variables were constructed using a 5-point Likert-type scale, which often resulted in cells of 5 or fewer cases in the contingency tables.

In a further attempt to identify statistically significant relationships among variables, discriminant function analyses were conducted. Discriminant function analysis is a convenient procedure when seeking to identify associations between a number of independent variables and a dependent variable. In essence, discriminant function analysis is a procedure for predicting the correct classification of cases, defined by the criterion variable, when the correct classification

is known. The variables are measured in terms of their ability to correctly predict, and this ability is expressed in a percentage of the total number of cases correctly classified.

Attitudinal variables were grouped together and a discriminant function analysis was conducted with "contributed," and then with "contributed to UW," as the criterion variable. The procedure was repeated with knowledge-related variables, the promotional variables and the demographic variables. The results are seen in Table 4 and 5. With "contributed" as the criterion variable, the attitudinal variables correctly predicted the classification of 70.6% of the cases, while knowledge-related variables predicted 63.07%, the promotion variables correctly classified 53.89%, and the demographic variables correctly classified 73.64% of the cases. With "contributed to UW" as the criterion variable, the attitudinal set correctly classified 68.71%, the knowledge-related set correctly classified 57.24%, the promotional set correctly classified 60.86%, and the demographic variables predicted 59.68%

With regard to individual variables within the sets, four of the ten attitudinal variables were found to be statistically significant with "contributed" as the criterion variable, while two of the knowledge-related variables were found statistically significant, with two of the promotional variables, and four of the five demographic variables statistically significant. With "contributed to UW" as the criterion variable, four of the attitudinal variables, one of the knowledge-related variables, three of the promotional variables and three of the demographic variables were found to be statistically significant (see Table 6 and 7).

The significant variables from each of the four groups were combined to form another set of variables, and subjected to discriminant analysis. This set

correctly classified 76.35% of the cases with "contributed" as the criterion variable (see Table 8).

Discussion and Conclusions

Many of the findings of prior research are supported by the results of this study. Prior research indicates that many of the factors related to the act of donating are demographic in nature -- age, income and education. This study provides additional evidence of that. In addition, this study found marital status linked to the act of donating.

On the other hand, some prior research indicated a relationships between knowledge and giving. However, this study found that contributors were no better informed than non-contributors in terms of estimates of administrative costs, criterion for selection of recipient agencies, or with regard to funds collected in a community remaining in the community. Also, contributors did no better than non-contributors in accurately identifying UW agencies. However, the results suggest that contributors want more information about these issues than do non-contributors, and there is some evidence that contributors seek out information through the group meetings and viewing of the UW film. Moreover, the group meetings are clearly related to the act of donating. It is less certain that group pressure is a factor, but peer pressure in the form of a solicitation letter or memo, definitely is related to giving.

Attitudes, in contrast in knowledge, are clearly related to giving. Cross-tabulation demonstrated substantial differences based on attitudes, and the chi square analysis indicated a relationship between attitudes and giving, and grouped attitudinal variables were a better predictor of behavior than the knowledge variables.

A sizable percentage of the respondents report that they feel there is too much pressure to contribute. This is equally true for those who donated as well as for those who did not and supports earlier findings.

With regard to mass and personal communication, the study supports the notion that both serve as parallel sources of communication. The interaction of mass and personal was not an area that this study pursued. However, based on the results of this study, it is clear that the mass media are far less persuasive, or are a less-trusted source, for those involved in deciding whether to contribute to a charity. Respondents did report a good deal of exposure to mass mediated messages. The fact that these respondents did not exhibit increased knowledge of charitable organizations or the way they work may be explained by the fact that most PSAs issued by the UW are emotional in nature rather than informational.

This study did not attempt to identify factors relating to frequency or amount of contributions reported in the literature. Nor did the study seek to examine a relationship between small companies and charitable-related activities, also reported in the literature. However, the fact that those employed in smaller companies are less likely to participate in UW activities suggests that those activities do not take place. Moreover, it is clear that the employee workforce of the smaller company is far less likely, as a group, to contribute than the employees of larger companies.

This study also did not directly examine the issue of constraints to giving. However, based on reaction to the question regarding payroll deduction, it seems reasonable to assume that there are constraints, that those constraints are related to donating, and that removal of those constraints could facilitate giving.

The profiles constructed from the frequencies of the sample subgroups depict non-donors as a group on a lower rung on the socio-economic ladder than donors, younger, more likely to be male and single, and more likely to be employed in a smaller company. The non-donor is less likely to recall seeing a newspaper advertisement for the UW or hearing a UW PSA on radio. However, the non-donor is more likely to recall seeing a televised PSA. This is probably a result of

the non-donors' media diet. Non-donors are younger, and younger population subgroups tend to be less frequent readers of newspapers than older members of the public.

What emerges is a portrait of a group (non-donors) less involved with and less interested in society. Based on their marital status, it is reasonable to assume that the non-donor is less likely to be a parent or homeowner. All of these factors no doubt contribute to the atittude that government rather than the community bears the responsibility for providing help to the needy.

The strength of the demographic variables as a predictor of donating is underscored by the discriminant factor analysis. The attitudinal variables were only slightly less of a predictor of that behavior. In fact, the mix of significant variables was only a slightly better predictor than the demographic variables alone. However, the set of significant variables was an appreciably better predictor of donating than the set of knowledge-related variables, and was considerably stronger in that regard than the set of promotional variables. When donating to UW was the criterion behavior, attitudes were an accurate predictor in about 70% of the cases, considerably stronger than promotions, demographics or knowledge, and only somewhat less accurate in predictive power than the combined set of variables.

There is a certain sense to this. Demographics, to a degree, define where an individual is in life, and we can gain a sense of overall lifestyle from those skeletal statistics. Demographics are less useful, however, when a more sharply focused picture is needed. Knowledge is likely to be gained as a result of involvement, but it is not likely that knowledge drove members of a group to attend a UW meeting or view a UW film. What stands out, however, is the apparent inability of mass media to affect the behavior of donating.

Attitudes, on the other hand, are not isolated bits and pieces of facts, as knowledge often is. Attitudes represent the accumulation of all our experiences --

attitudes are all that we have accumulated as the result of our life experiences. Attitudes represent all that we have learned, and our perspective as influenced by our interests relative to the interests of others. Our attitudes are, in short, what Schramm refers to as our "frame of reference."

Nonetheless, none of the groups of variables predicted as well as the set of significant variables. This suggests that this behavior is affected by a number of different types of factors. This, in turn, supports the view that public relations is an open subsystem operating within a larger environment, affected by other subsystems, while at the same time influencing the environment in which it operates. The fact that the combined set was able to accurately predict the classification of three-fourths of the cases, while certainly useful, also suggests there are variables operating not identified in this study.

Need for Further Research

Clearly, there is a need for further research. The question of constraints to the act of giving should be explored more specifically. Similarly, additional research, building on this and other research, might be able to better identify underlying constructs which drive behavior in this area. Methodologically, the results of this study may enable researchers to identify subjects for additional study by screening based on a small number of predictor variables. Replication of this study on an annual basis, coupled to the content of promotional efforts, might provide better insight into the relationship between audience characteristics and promotional appeals. That, in turn, could provide additional material for theory building in this area to the degree that theory represents, as William McGuire[28] suggests, insight into reality.

FOOTNOTES

1 Scott M. Cutlip, Allen H. Center and Glen M. Broom, Effective Public Relations, 6th edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1985, p.16

2 Donald T. Mogavero, "When the Funds Come Tumbling Down," Public Relations Journal, October, 1981, pp.12-13

3 Don Bates, "11 Signal Trends in Not-For-Profit Organizations," Public Relations Journal, November, 1982, pp.22-23

4 Glen M. Broom and David M. Dozier, "Advancement for Public Relations Role Models," Public Relations Review, Vol. 12, No. 1, Spring, 1986, pp.37-56; Cutlip, Center and Broom, pp.68-70

5 For example, see recommendations by the United Way (volunteer) Committee in "A changing society will reshape roles and techniques," Public Relations Journal, June, 1984, pp. 33-34

6 For an excellent example of the use of experimental research in this context, see Joel Brockner, Beth Guzzi, Julie Kane, Ellen Levine and Kate Shaplen, "Organizational Fundraising: Further Evidence on the Effects of Legitimizing Small Donations," Journal of Consumer Research, January, 1984, pp.611-614

7 Herbert H. Hyman and Paul B. Sheatsley, "Some Reasons Why Information Campaigns Fail," Public Opinion Quarterly, 11, 1947, pp.412-423

8 Raymond Bauer, "The Obstinate Audience: The Influence Process from the Point-of-View of Social Communication, American Psychologist, 19, 1964, pp.319-328

9 Harold Mendelsohn, "Some Reasons Why Information Campaigns Can Succeed," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37, 1973, pp.50-61

10 James A. Files, "Study shows that public information campaigns work," Public Relations Journal, January, 1984, pp.8-9, reports on a paper presented by Garrett J. O'Keefe concerning the results of an Ad Council campaign to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August, 1983

11 Barry Keating, Robert Pitts and David L. Appel, "United Way Contributions: Coercion, Charity or Economic Self-Interest?," Southern Economic Journal, 47, Spring, 1981, pp.816-823

12 James E. Grunig and Daniel A. Ipes, "The Anatomy of a Campaign Against Drunk Driving," Public Relations Review, Summer, 1983, pp.36-52

13 Steven Chaffee, "Mass Media in Political Campaigns: An Expanding Role," in Public Communication Campaigns, edited by Ronald E. Rice and William J. Paisley, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California, 1981, pp.181-198

14 Brenda Dervin, "Mass Communication: Changing Conceptions of the Audience," in Rice and Paisley, pp.71-87

15 Ibid

16 Garrett J. O'Keefe, Harold Mendelsohn and Jenny Liu, "The Audience for Public Service Advertising: An Exploratory View," paper presented to the Advertising Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August, 1980

17 Brad Edmondson, "Who Gives to Charity?," American Demographics, 8, November, 1986, pp.44-46

18 Keating, Pitts and Appel, p.821

19 _____, General Public Focus Groups Research Summary, unpublished report on results of four focus groups conducted on behalf of the United Way, Dade County, Florida. Reported dated December 22, 1986

20 O'Keefe, Mendelsohn and Liu, p.10

21 _____, "Charity: When Big is Better," Inc., February, 1987, p.11

22 David J. Blum, "Many Workers Oppose Employers' Pressures to Give to Charities," Wall Street Journal, January 12, 1982, p.1, also Bates, p.23

23 David Horton Smith, "United Way Is the Name, Monopoly Is the Game," Business and Society Review, Spring, 1978, pp.30-34

24 Hyman and Sheatsley, p.421

25 Chaffee, p.194, also see Grunig and Ipes, p.37

26 Stephen W. Littlejohn, Theories of Human Communication, second edition, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California, 1983, pp.29-43

[27] Ibid, p.291

[28] William J. McGuire, "Theoretical Foundations of Campaigns," p.42 in Rice and Paisley

TABLE 1

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

	All respondents	UW givers	Other givers	All givers	Non-givers
Age groups:					
29 years & younger	27.1%	22.0%	33.9%	25.3%	51.7%*
30 - 39 years of age	29.1%	29.2%	29.8%	29.3%	27.6%
40 - 49 years of age	22.1%	21.7%	19.4%	21.0%	10.3%
50 - 59 years of age	16.7%	21.1%	10.5%	18.3%	5.2%
60 years and older	4.5%	6.0%	6.5%	6.1%	5.2%
Income levels:					
Less than $10,000 annually	11.8%	7.2%	18.1%	8.6%	36.2%
$10,000 - $19,999	19.2%	16.0%	22.6%	18.1%	27.6%
$20,000 - $29,999	21.2%	23.0%	19.4%	21.9%	15.5%
$30,000 - $39,999	19.6%	21.7%	19.4%	21.0%	8.6%
$40,000 - $49,999	8.2%	11.0%	4.8%	9.3%	-----
More than $50,000	7.4%	8.2%	8.1%	8.1%	1.7%
No response	12.8%	12.9%	13.7%	13.1%	10.3%
Education levels:					
Some high school	9.8%	10.1%	7.3%	9.3%	13.8%
High school graduate	42.3%	39.3%	43.5%	40.6%	55.2%
Some college	22.6%	24.5%	19.4%	23.0%	19.0%
College graduate	14.8%	16.0%	14.5%	15.6%	8.6%
Graduate work	10.6%	10.1%	15.3%	11.5%	3.4%
Marital status:					
Married	69.8%	74.5%	68.5%	72.7%	47.4%
Divorced	10.8%	11.9%	8.9%	11.1%	8.8%
Separated	.6%	0.0%	.8%	.2%	3.5%
Widowed	2.4%	2.8%	.8%	2.3%	3.5%
Never married	16.4%	10.7%	21.0%	13.8%	36.8%
Size of workforce at place of employment:					
Less than 25	31.0%	24.6%	41.1%	29.4%	43.1%
26 - 50	11.4%	9.8%	13.7%	10.9%	15.5%
51 - 100	8.8%	8.8%	5.6%	7.9%	15.5%
More than 100	48.8%	56.8%	39.5%	51.8%	25.9%
Member of labor union:	20.4%	22.1%	21.0%	21.7%	10.3%
Gender:					
Male	50.4%	46.0%	57.3%	49.1%	60.3%
Female	49.6%	54.0%	42.7%	50.9%	39.7%

TABLE 1 continued

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

	All respondents	UW givers	Other givers	All givers	Non-givers
	(percentage agreeing with statement)				
"Most of the money contributed to the UW is donated by corporations and other large businesses."	54.8%	52.9%	54.8%	53.2%	67.2%
"Contributors to the UW should be able to decide which charity recieves their donations."	71.5%	79.8%	83.8%	71.0%	84.5%
"UW is an efficient was to collect funds for a large number of organizations."	86.4%	92.8%	70.9%	86.7%	84.5%
"The UW funds agencies which make our community a better place for all."	86.2%	91.8%	78.2%	88.1%	71.5%
"There is too much pressure from management to contribute to the UW."	45.1%	44.0%	48.4%	45.1%	44.9%
"The UW distributes funds to agencies based on need."	58.9%	62.3%	50.0%	58.7%	60.3%
"No one I know is likely to use any of the UW agencies."	33.2%	29.8%	34.7%	31.4%	46.6%
"The UW should not fund organizations such as Planned Parenthood."	25.6%	22.6%	31.5%	25.0%	29.3%
"Money collected by UW in our community remains in this community."	63.6%	66.0%	61.3%	64.7%	55.2%
"Nowadays, organizations like UQ are not as useful as they might have been in the past."	27.4%	21.7%	38.7%	26.4%	34.5%

TABLE 1 continued

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

	All respondents	UW givers	Other givers	All givers	Non-givers
	(percentage agreeing with statement)				
"Most of the money contributed to the UW is donated by corporations and other large businesses."	54.8%	52.9%	54.8%	53.2%	67.2%
"Contributors to the UW should be able to decide which charity recieves their donations."	71.5%	79.8%	83.8%	71.0%	84.5%
"UW is an efficient was to collect funds for a large number of organizations."	86.4%	92.8%	70.9%	86.7%	84.5%
"The UW funds agencies which make our community a better place for all."	86.2%	91.8%	78.2%	88.1%	71.5%
"There is too much pressure from management to contribute to the UW."	45.1%	44.0%	48.4%	45.1%	44.9%
"The UW distributes funds to agencies based on need."	58.9%	62.3%	50.0%	58.7%	60.3%
"No one I know is likely to use any of the UW agencies."	33.2%	29.8%	34.7%	31.4%	46.6%
"The UW should not fund organizations such as Planned Parenthood."	25.6%	22.6%	31.5%	25.0%	29.3%
"Money collected by UW in our community remains in this community."	63.6%	66.0%	61.3%	64.7%	55.2%
"Nowadays, organizations like UQ are not as useful as they might have been in the past."	27.4%	21.7%	38.7%	26.4%	34.5%

TABLE 1 continued

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

	All respondents	UW givers	Other givers	All givers	Non-givers
			(percentage agreeing with statement)		
"There are too many charitable organizations seeking funds."	52.1%	50.9%	50.8%	51.0%	60.3%
"Everyone should give his/her fair share to charity each year."	77.2%	80.9%	77.4%	79.9%	56.9%
"Payroll deduction is an efficient way to contribute to charitable organizations."	51.7%	58.8%	41.9%	54.0%	34.5%
"Very little of what is contributed to charities each year actually goes to help those who need it."	58.4%	55.6%	58.8%	57.3%	67.2%
"Charities are competing against one another for the same money."	80.8%	81.8%	79.9%	81.3%	77.6%
"Government should provide all the services for those in need."	29.4%	25.4%	31.7%	27.2%	46.5%
			(percentage rating it important)		
Child welfare services	57.1%	57.2%	54.8%	56.4%	62.1%
Services for the elderly	72.9%	72.6%	70.2%	72.0%	79.3%
Rehabilitation services for the handicapped	50.1%	50.9%	42.7%	49.4%	55.2%
Services for the poor and needy	30.3%	29.6%	33.9%	30.7%	27.6%
Family counseling services	17.9%	19.2%	12.9%	17.4%	15.5%
Drug and alcohol treatment services	40.3%	37.7%	45.2%	40.0%	43.1%
Health-related services	28.9%	28.3%	37.1%	30.7%	15.5%
Contributed to a charity during the past 12 months	88.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	00.0%
Contributed to UW during the past year	71.9%	100.0%	00.0%	71.9%	00.00%

Table 1 continued

COMPARISONS OF FREQUENCIES FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

	All respondents	UW givers	Other givers	All givers	Non-givers
			(percentage agreeing)		
The following are associated with UW:					
American Cancer Society	46.7%	44.7%	49.2%	45.8%	53.4%
Big Brothers/Big Sisters	68.9%	69.5%	67.7%	58.8%	69.0%
Mental Health Association	65.1%	68.2%	60.5%	65.9%	58.6%
Rehabilitation Center	71.1%	73.3%	68.5%	71.8%	65.5%
Second Chance Halfway House	39.5%	39.3%	39.5%	39.3%	41.4%
American Heart Association	53.1%	51.6%	54.8%	52.4%	58.6%
Alcoholics Anonymous	36.5%	37.4%	33.1%	36.1%	39.7%
Lukemia Society	42.5%	38.4%	45.2%	40.2%	60.3%
March of Dimes	48.7%	41.8%	60.5%	47.0%	62.1%
Easter Seals	48.3%	41.8%	59.7%	46.7%	60.3%
Salvations Army	45.5%	46.2%	46.8%	46.3%	39.7%
Red Cross	54.5%	53.3%	54.0%	54.9%	51.7%
			(percentage recalling)		
Tell me if you recall seeing or hearing information about the UW via:					
A group meeting at work	37.5%	48.7%	18.5%	40.2%	17.2%
Letter or memo	38.1%	46.9%	24.2%	40.4%	20.7%
A UW film	18.2%	22.0%	10.5%	18.7%	13.8%
A newspaper ad	43.3%	44.0%	45.2%	44.2%	36.2%
Radio	43.7%	45.9%	41.1%	44.5%	37.9%
A billboard	39.1%	39.6%	41.9%	40.2%	31.0%
Television	32.7%	30.2%	37.9%	32.5%	34.5%
Out of every dollar collected by the UW, how much of that dollar do you believe is distributed to the agencies incolved?	52.4¢	55.0¢	50.7¢	53.8¢	42.3%

Table 2

Statistically Significant Crosstabulations
With "Contributed" as the Dependent Variable

Size of place of employment:	$X^2 = 14.51427$; df = 3;	0.0023
Health-related services:	$X^2 = 5.03376$; df = 1;	0.0249
UW gets most funds from big companies:	$X^2 = 9.20858$; df = 4;	0.0561
UW information from group meet at work:	$X^2 = 10.55360$; df = 1;	0.0012
UW information from memo at work:	$X^2 = 7.63648$; df = 1;	0.0057
Education:	$X^2 = 8.84908$; df = 4;	0.0550

Table 3

Statistically Significant Crosstabulations
With "Contributed to UW" as the Dependent Variable

Size of place of employment:	X^2 = 15.84291; df = 3;	0.0012
UW distributes funds based on need:	X^2 = 9.66318; df = 4;	0.0465
Funds collected in this community stay in this community:	X^2 = 13.10703; df = 4;	0.0108
Obtained information concerning UW from a group meeting at work:	X^2 = 32.56917; df = 1;	0.0000
Obtained information concerning UW from a memo received at work:	X^2 = 18.08420; df = 1;	0.0000
Obtained information concerning UW from viewing a UW film at work:	X^2 = 7.03676; df = 1;	0.0080
Age:	X^2 = 10.75046; df = 4;	0.0295
Gender:	X^2 = 4.04862; df = 1;	0.0442

Table 4

CLASSIFICATION OF CASES WITH "CONTRIBUTED" AS CRITERION VARIABLE

Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2
Attitudinal Variable:			
Group 1 Yes	442	314 71.0%	128 29.0%
Group 2 No	58	19 32.8%	39 67.2%
Percent of "Grouped"Cases Correctly Classified: 70.50%			
Knowledge Variables:			
Group 1 Yes	443	279 63.0%	164 37.0%
Group 2 No	58	21 36.2%	37 63.8%
Percent of "Grouped"Cases Correctly Classified: 63.07%			
Promotional Variables			
Group 1 Yes	443	226 51.0%	217 49.0%
Group 2 No	58	14 24.1%	44 75.9%
Percent of "Grouped"Cases Correctly Classified: 53.89%			
Demographic Variables:			
Group 1 Yes	440	324 74.5%	116 26.4%
Group 2 No	57	15 26.3%	42 73.7%
Percent of "Grouped"Cases Correctly Classified: 73.64%			

Table 5

CLASSIFICATION OF CASES WITH
"CONTRIBUTED TO UW" AS THE CRITIERION VARIABLE

Attitudinal Variables:

Actual Group		No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2
Group Yes	1	318	329 72.0%	89 28.0%
Group No	2	123	49 39.8%	74 60.2%
Ungrouped Cases		59	25 42.4%	34 57.6%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 68.71%

Knowledge Variables:

Group Yes	1	318	187 58.8%	131 41.2%
Group No	2	124	58 46.8%	66 53.2%
Ungrouped Cases		59	33 55.9%	26 44.1%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 57.24%

Promotional Variables:

Group Yes	1	318	177 55.7%	144 44.3%
Group No	2	124	32 25.8%	92 74.2%
Ungrouped Cases		59	15 25.4%	44 74.6%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 60.85%

Demographic Variables:

Group Yes	1	315	197 62.5%	118 37.5%
Group No	2	124	59 47.6%	55 52.4%
Ungrouped Cases		58	21 36.2%	37 63.8%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 59.68%

Table 6

DISCRIMINANT FACTOR ANALYSIS OF GROUPS OF VARIABLES
WITH "CONTRIBUTED" AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE

Attitudnal Variables	Wilk's Lambda	F	Significance
Too Many Shares	0.99905	0.47	0.4921
Fair Share	0.96359	18.82	0.0000*
Payroll Deduct Efficient	0.98581	7.17	0.0077*
Gov't Provide All	0.97102	14.86	0.0001*
Contributors Decide	0.99982	0.91	0.7618
UW Efficient	0.99710	1.44	0.2297
UW Better for All	0.97344	13.59	0.0003*
Pressure to Give	0.99940	0.29	0.5843
No Planned Parenthood	0.99970	0.14	0.7008
Not as Useful	0.99656	1.71	0.1905
Knowledge Variables			
Very Little	0.99804	0.97	0.3231
Charities Compete	0.99950	0.24	0.6187
$ from Big Corps	0.98846	5.82	0.0162*
Based on Need	0.99998	0.11	0.9141
No One I Know	0.99137	4.34	0.0377*
$ Stays in Area	0.99469	2.66	0.1034
Promotional Variables			
Group Meeting	0.97702	11.73	0.0007*
Letter or Memo	0.98313	8.56	0.0036*
UW Film	0.99832	0.84	0.3596
Newspaper Ad	0.99731	1.34	0.2453
Radio PSA	0.99822	0.88	0.3462
Billboard	0.99640	1.88	0.1803
TV PSA	0.99982	0.90	0.7634
Demographic Variables			
Age	0.97232	14.09	0.0002*
Education	0.98462	7.73	0.0056*
Marital Status	0.95451	23.59	0.0000*
Income	0.96883	15.90	0.0001*
Gender	0.99547	2.25	0.1341

Table 7

DISCRIMINANT FACTOR ANALYSIS OF GROUPS OF VARIABLES
WITH "CONTRIBUTED TO UW" AS THE CRITERION VARIABLE

Attitudinal variables	Wilk's Lambda	F	Significance
Too Many Charities	0.99858	0.62	0.4299
Fair share	0.99749	1.10	0.2939
Payroll Deduct Efficient	0.95648	19.98	0.0000*
Gov't Provide All	0.99759	1.06	0.3034
Contributors Decide	0.99943	0.25	0.6160
UW Efficient	0.90482	45.18	0.0000*
UW Better for all	0.94745	24.35	0.0000*
Pressure to Give	0.99768	1.01	0.3134
No Planned Parenthood	0.99243	3.34	0.0679
Not as Useful	0.98061	8.68	0.0034
Knowledge Variables			
Little to Help	0.99770	1.01	0.3143
Charities Compete	0.99584	1.83	0.1760
$ from Big Corps	0.99954	0.20	0.6529
Based on Need	0.98958	4.63	0.0319
No One I Know	0.99600	1.76	0.1843
$ Stays in Area	0.99691	1.36	0.2434
Promotional Variables			
Group	0.92350	36.45	0.0000*
Letter or Memo	0.95698	19.78	0.0000*
UW Film	0.98241	7.87	0.0052*
Newspaper Ad	0.99989	0.46	0.8295
Radio PSA	0.99813	0.82	0.3645
Billboard	0.99955	0.19	0.6569
TV PSA	0.99451	2.42	0.1199
Demographic Variables			
Age	0.98492	6.69	0.0100*
Education	0.99841	0.69	0.4040
Marital Status	0.98815	5.24	0.0225*
Income	0.99773	0.99	0.3197
Gender	0.98978	4.51	0.0342*

Table 8

CLASSIFICATION OF CASES

Contributed

Actual Group		No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2
Group Yes	1	442	338 76.5%	104 23.5%
Group No	2	57	14 24.5%	43 75.4%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 76.35%

Contributed to UW

Group Yes	1	315	239 75.9%	76 24.1%
Group No	2	124	39 31.5%	85 58.5%
Ungrouped Cases		58	17 29.3%	41 70.7%

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 73.80%